

September 1955
VI, No. 4

CALIFORNIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

IN THIS ISSUE

L11
C18

- Prediction of Teaching Success
- English Usage in Colleges
- Leaderless Group Discussion
- Homemaking Offerings in California
- Analysis of Parent-Teacher Conferences
- The Temperament of Gifted Children
- Action Research Workshop

**UNDER CALL
NUMBER**

published by

CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

693 Sutter Street San Francisco 2 California



CALIFORNIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Published by the CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION for the
CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Editor

KENNETH R. BROWN
Director of Research, C.T.A.
and Chairman of the Council

Associate Editor

GARFORD G. GORDON
Assistant Director of Research, C.T.A.
and Secretary of the Council

EDITORIAL BOARD: MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

HUGH M. BELL
Dean, Student Personnel and Guidance
Chico State College

LILLIE L. BOWMAN
Director, Bureau of Research
San Francisco Unified School District

HAROLD D. CARTER
Professor of Education
University of California, Berkeley

ARTHUR P. COLADARCI
Associate Professor of Education
Stanford University

ROBERT E. CRALLE
Executive Secretary
California Association of School Administrators
Pasadena, California

MERLE H. ELLIOTT
Director of Research
Oakland City Schools

D. WELTY LEFEVER
Professor of Education
University of Southern California

ALFRED S. LEWERENZ
Director, Evaluation and Research
Los Angeles City Schools

HENRY W. MAGNUSON
Chief, Bureau of Education Research
State Department of Education

DAVID G. RYANS
Professor of Education
University of California at Los Angeles

HARRY W. SMALLENBURG
Director, Division of Research and Guidance
Los Angeles County Schools

WILLIAM H. STEGEMAN
Director of Research
San Diego City Schools

HENRY I. WEITZEL
Research Director
Pasadena City Schools

Published at San Francisco five times a year: January, March, May, September, and November. Subscription price, \$6.00 per year; single copies, \$1.50. All correspondence should be directed to: CALIFORNIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, 693 Sutter Street, San Francisco 2, California. Checks should be made payable to the CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION.

Certain articles in this *Journal* are listed in *Psychological Abstracts*.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at San Francisco, California

Copyright 1955 by the California Teachers Association



CALIFORNIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Volume VI

September, 1955

Number 4

CONTENTS

A Real Research Task, <i>An Editorial</i>	146
Prediction of Teaching Success: Rating by Authority Figures . . . <i>J. C. Gowan</i>	147
A Descriptive Analysis of Selected Parent-Teacher Conferences . . <i>Harold J. Maves</i>	153
Practices Relative to Satisfactory English Usage at Selected Institutions <i>R. Grann Lloyd</i>	157
The Temperament of Gifted Children <i>Marcella Ryser Bonsall and Buford Steffle</i>	162
Leaderless Group Discussion and Experience in Group Leadership . <i>Robert Ames</i>	166
Changes in GATB Scores With College Training <i>Garth Sorenson and Noel Senior</i>	170
Evaluation of Group Processes in a Sixth Grade Social Studies Program <i>George Bovyer</i>	174
Superior Graduates Look at Their School Guidance <i>Michael Herbert Kütredge</i>	178
Sociometric Analysis and Personality Adjustment <i>Robert Louis Satterlee</i>	181
Homemaking Offerings in California <i>George N. Beaumariage, Jr.</i>	185
Workshop on Action Research	188
Book Reviews	189

THE EDITORS SAY:

A Real Research Task

Compulsory reading for school people generally and education researchers particularly is *Report on Grading Methods in the California Schools*, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, California Legislature, 1955 Regular Session. The report comes to vital conclusions on areas of school practice to which educational research in the past has made contributions, or should have. It is a report which is important for its revelation about lay citizen belief of what is present in the schools, at least about legislative belief.

In the framework of its avowed purpose of checking up on potential subversiveness in public school procedures, and its possible presumption that educators' concern over group processes and outcomes denotes a predilection for socialism rather than competitive enterprise, the report is not a blanket condemnation of existing practices in pupil reporting. However, one cannot mistake the pointed earnestness of the implications that the more recent developments in pupil progress reporting are largely wrong, if not socialistic.

Especially is serious doubt cast on the growth of the parent-teacher conference. Is it too time consuming? Is it required basically to bolster a system of unintelligible reporting which good teachers do not really want anyhow? Is it an undesirable, unwarranted infringement on the responsibilities of the home? Is it merely an end product of "progressive education" and the hypothesis of the "whole child" curriculum? On these issues the report suggests that the parent-teacher conference is of negative value unless accompanied by traditional report cards, graded on fixed standards of pupil achievement.

In these days of heavy emphasis on school-parent-community relationships or, to use an older term, school public relations, this challenge of the Senate Committee should not go unanswered. We must re-examine our research to see whether it stands up to this criticism. It bodes no good for the schools that the State Legislature appears to believe that one of our important functional areas is operated at variance with facts about human nature and with widely accepted socio-economic usages prevailing among our citizens. Educational research should be in a position either to support the conclusions of the Senate Committee, or to refute them vigorously, or to propose suitable revisions of them. We cannot just remain silent.

There are items in the report with which our research surely finds agreement. We should read the report to identify items on which there seems to be disagreement with research findings, then get to work to verify the findings or provide new facts for both the Legislature and the schools. There should be common meeting ground on substantial facts.

Research problem: For reporting pupil progress, what is the most desirable and productive combination, if any, of the parent-teacher conference, relatively fixed standards of pupil achievement, and a competitive system

(Continued on Page 156)

Prediction of Teaching Success: Rating by Authority Figures

J. C. GOWAN

One of the great stumbling blocks in teacher training is the lack of common criteria of what constitutes effective teaching. Commenting on this point, the minutes of the Third Annual State Conference on Educational Research said in part:

The greatest obstacle to research in this field is lack of reliable and valid criteria of effective teaching performance. Training institutions, school districts, and teaching groups must arrive at some common agreement on the definition and characteristics of a good teacher before researchers can develop the necessary methods and procedures for selection. (1:12)

During the last few years there has been a gradual shift on the part of research away from the emphasis on skills, intelligence, and background on the part of teaching candidates, and to the interpersonal relations of the teacher in influencing student performance (2, 4). Ryans, indeed, has pointed out (5:22) that pupil growth and achievement is the ultimate criterion of teaching effectiveness, but he concludes in the same article that this is exceedingly difficult to measure. How then shall we gauge the effectiveness of teachers, or the potential of teaching candidates in our training institutions?

The following methods comprise the chief ways in which it has been held possible to measure teaching performance:

I. Ratings

A. by authority figures

1. by professors or training teachers in the training institution
2. by supervisors, principals, or superintendents in the field

B. by peer figures

1. by other teachers in the same school (or in case of trainees, other classmates)
2. by trained observers or "experts" from outside whose ratings will have no bearing on the teacher's advancement

C. by pupils

John Curtis Gowan is Assistant Professor of Education at Los Angeles State College. He was previously a counselor for the Culver Military Academy in Indiana and an observer for the American Council of Education Teacher Characteristics Study. He received his doctorate from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1952.

II. Tests

- A. of teacher ability, background, and subject knowledge
- B. of teacher interests and personality.
- C. of pupil gain

It is the purpose of this present paper to discuss some implications of the method outlined in IA: Ratings by Authority Figures. It should be noted at the outset that this is an easy method to employ. Authority figures are fond of giving ratings. Most of them feel a sense of personal satisfaction in doing so, and a modicum of modest pride in being rather shrewd judges of teaching competence. After all, it is, so to speak, their business. Besides, one sometimes hears the *ad hoc* argument that since authority figures decide on grades and promotion, what *they* think is what counts. This kind of argument is basically equivalent to a method of eliminating poor teachers by handing around a loaded revolver at faculty meeting, and playing Russian Roulette. What happens will certainly count in the sense of there being one less teacher (or principal, as the case may be) but how can we be sure that the method will automatically select the proper victim?

A first approach to the problem might be to inquire whether the authority figures agree among themselves as to who are the effective teachers. In a study (3) undertaken for the Education Department of U.C.L.A. by the writer, correlations were secured between field ratings of principals (or superintendents), student teaching grades, and placement office ratings. The subjects were all women elementary school teachers with less than three years of experience who had been trained and credentialed by the University. The results are shown in Table I.

TABLE I
Correlation Between Various Teacher Ratings

Criterion	N	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error
Field ratings vs. Student teaching grades	154	$r = .23$.08
Field ratings vs. Placement ratings	228	$C = .17$.07
Student teaching grades vs. Placement ratings	124	$C = .22$.09

None of these correlations can be considered significant. In the case of field ratings by administrators versus student teaching grades, it is true that when 36 students who had top teaching grades and 31 students who had bottom teaching grades were compared on field ratings, these criterion groups were distinguished by Chi-square technique with a probability of less than .01, and a coefficient of contingency of .44 with a standard error of .13. It appears that outstanding students at either end in supervised teaching may be distinguishable. There was a correlation of .33 established between a selected group of placement office cases and field ratings, but

this correlation while probably significant at the 5% level is still far too low for individual prediction. The evidence in this case was that those responsible for the training of teachers and those into whose employ teachers pass were not able to agree as to their merits, and that neither was either able to agree with the assessment of the placement office.

Exhibit B comes from the same source and consists of a validation study on the intercorrelations between measures and ratings on 29 of the previous subjects on whom it was possible to assemble the following information:

1. Student teaching grades (9 categories)
2. Superintendents' ratings (5 categories)
3. "X," "Democratic-permissive" teacher behavior from Research Instrument X
4. "Y," "Responsible-systematic" teacher behavior from Research Instrument X
5. "H," "Overall teacher behavior" from Research Instrument X
6. Socioeconomic status as measured by Research Instrument X
7. Total points on observers' evaluation of classroom performance.

Results are shown in Table II.

TABLE II
Intercorrelations and Standard Errors Between Certain Teacher Variables
N = 29

Category or Rating	Category or Rating						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Student teaching		.22	-.01	.03	-.17	-.11	<u>.38</u>
2. Field rating	.19		.04	.09	-.04	<u>.48</u>	<u>.08</u>
3. "X"	.19	.19		<u>.40</u>	<u>.63</u>	-.29	.07
4. "Y"	.19	.19	.15		<u>.50</u>	.07	-.07
5. "H"	.19	.19	.11	.14		-.12	.13
6. Socioeconomic status	.19	.15	.18	.19	.19		-.13
7. Observers' total	.16	.19	.19	.19	.19	.19	

The intercorrelations are in the upper right portion of the table and their standard errors are in the lower left.

The rank difference method was used for intercorrelations, yielding a "rho" value. The intercorrelations are in the upper right half, while their standard errors are in the lower left half. Any correlation coefficient more than two and a half times its standard error has been underlined. It will be noted that in addition to the intercorrelations between the factors of Research Instrument X there are only two significant correlations in the table. The first is that of .38 between student teaching and observers' total. This is not hard to understand since each depends upon the observation of teaching performance by an expert. The other is more novel and suggestive. It

is the highest intercorrelation of the table (Research Instrument X intercorrelations excepted) and is, surprisingly enough, that between the field rating of the administrator and the socioeconomic status of the teacher.

This appears to mean that superintendents are more conscious of factors which contribute to the socioeconomic status of a teacher than of any other measures used in the study. Whatever these factors are, they are evidently more connected with public relations and with relations with superiors, and with appraisal of the individual in a group in which status in the group is a factor, than they are with the careful and disinterested judgment of an expert, whether he is an observer, a supervising teacher, or other investigator. They may reflect the possibility that superintendents, not knowing the individual teachers well, may tend to judge them by socioeconomic class standards. More research is obviously needed in this area.

Exhibit C consists of some intercorrelations on 110 juniors in sections of a beginning class in educational psychology. All of these students were known personally to the writer over the course of five hours per week for a semester. The class atmosphere was informal; these were not lecture sections, and a considerable degree of group interaction was evident. In an effort to discover whether he too had been blinded by the glasses of an authority relationship, he made four separate assessment ratings of the class, as follows:

- X_1 : general teaching effectiveness as judged by the instructor
- X_2 : social nearness to the instructor (by an honest if tortured answer to the question: "How much would you like to associate socially with Blank?")
- X_3 : student's financial wealth, as estimated by the instructor
- X_4 : Socio-economic status of student's parental home, as estimated by the instructor.

The intercorrelations between these ratings, and their standard errors, are given in Table III.

TABLE III
Intercorrelations and Standard Errors Between Various Ratings
N = 110

Criterion	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
X_1 : teaching effectiveness		.87	.71	.75
X_2 : social nearness	.04		.67	.66
X_3 : financial wealth	.06	.07		.81
X_4 : parental S-E status	.06	.07	.05	

The intercorrelations are in the upper right portion of the table and their standard errors are in the lower left.

The figures speak for themselves. The high intercorrelations between them, and especially the high correlation between teaching effectiveness and social

nearness, indicates rather graphically how much trust the writer is justified in putting his estimate of teacher effectiveness as being a measure of teacher effectiveness.

The measure X_4 (estimated socioeconomic status of parental home) was chosen in particular because rather extensive test materials on these students included a measure of the actual home status. The correlation between estimated status and actual status was .34 and its standard error was .09. The measure X_3 (estimated financial wealth of student) was also chosen because it was an actual measureable quantity. The correlation between this estimate and actual parental socioeconomic status was .40 and its standard error was .09. Thus once again we are brought to a situation where the rating of an observer of a certain quality in a group of subjects turns out to be much more correlated with their nearness to him than with their actual possession of the quality in question. The situation is analogous to asking an intelligent person unskilled in astronomy to go out on a starlit night and estimate the absolute magnitude of the hundred brightest stars. He, having no way of allowing for the variable of distance, would tend to assign higher values to those nearer stars whose relative magnitudes were highest. The correlation between his ratings and the actual absolute magnitude of the stars themselves would be much less than the correlation between his ratings and the proximity of the stars, even though he thought he was rating the former, rather than the latter.

If an occasional teacher or superintendent finds that his ratings tend to correlate substantially with objective tests results on teachers, it is probably less due to the fact that he is able at rating than to the effect of his being the kind of person who tends to attract differentially the type of students or teachers who respond to the interpersonal relations climate he fosters.

These experiments (or perhaps one should say failures) in rating techniques, suggest (although they do not establish) the following hypothesis:

When an authority figure rates a group of subordinates on a certain variable, his rating will be more highly correlated with the patterns of identification established by his value system than with the actual variable itself.

These patterns of identification will naturally differ for different raters. In general they will cluster around the well-known stereotypes of power such as wealth, socioeconomic status, social nearness, the idealized image, and so forth. They always involve the "built-in" quality that they depend upon the position of the observer, thus accounting for a kind of relativity in social space.

The hypothesis has been suggested as applying to authority figures in teacher rating situations. Whether it applies also to the ratings of non-authority figures such as the disinterested expert who comes into the system briefly, and with a minimum of interpersonal relation, and whose rating is neither to the advantage nor harm of the subject, is not stated. Neither is the extension of the hypothesis to other types of rating situations justified by the facts here presented. One may hope, however, that further research

in these related areas may establish other aspects of the kind of social envelope which seems to surround an authority figure and which appears so apt to blind him to reality.

Summary

The rating of teachers and teacher-trainees by authority figures such as principals and training professors is discussed. Examples are introduced to show that correlations of such ratings are not reliable and that in general they tend to measure identification patterns of the rater, such as social nearness to the subject, rather than teaching effectiveness. A hypothesis for further research is propounded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. California Teachers Association. "Minutes of the Third Annual State Conference on Educational Research." *C.T.A. Research Bulletin* 38: December 1951.
2. Durlfanger, G. W. "Evaluation of In-Service Training of Teachers: Measurement and Evaluation of Teaching Success." In *C.T.A. Research Bulletin* 38: December 1951.
3. Gowan, J. C. *A Comparison of Women Graduates in Elementary Education with Teachers Holding Emergency Credentials*. Mimeographed Research Project, Department of Education, U.C.L.A., 1953.
4. Ryans, D. G. "A Study of the Extent of Association of Certain Professional and Personal Data with Judged Effectiveness of Teacher Behavior." *Journal of Experimental Education* 20: 67-77, September 1951.
5. Ryans, David G. "Teacher Personnel Research, I. Considerations Relative to Research Design." *California Journal of Educational Research* 4: 19-27, January 1953.

The June, 1955, issue of the *Review of Educational Research* is devoted to teacher personnel. It consists of an introduction and seven chapters. Some of the topics covered are: Certification, recruitment, in-service training, employment practices, status of teachers, and the measurement and prediction of "teacher efficiency." California is represented by Chapter II, "Recruitment, Guidance, and Screening of Prospective Elementary- and Secondary-School Teachers," written by Howard S. Bretsch and Gene S. Jacobsen of the University of California at Berkeley.

Arthur P. Coladarci, Stanford University, and Jack Getzels, University of Chicago, have prepared a monograph, *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration*, to be published in October by the Stanford University Press. The authors have attempted to demonstrate the necessary interrelationship between theory and practice, and provide an illustration of the use of theory in school administration.

A Descriptive Analysis of Selected Parent-Teacher Conferences

HAROLD J. MAVES

The parent-teacher conference type of pupil evaluation is generally accepted and increasingly practiced today.

The need to determine what characteristics evolve from actual parent-teacher conferences, however, is pronounced since investigations of this kind are virtually nil or unrecorded. Contemporary articles give the here's-how-to-do-it to parents and teachers but offer little or no basis for their suggestions. The here's-how-to-do-it promulgations generally relate to artificially structured or simulated conferences.

This analysis was made from tape recordings of twenty-four actual conferences relative to children of the elementary grades to determine aims, procedures and content of conferences and the resultant reactions of parents and teachers. Half the conferences were done in a middle socio-economic level, half in a low level.

Eight teachers participated in the study. Half were men. Each teacher recorded three conferences in succession according to the day's schedule during the regular semi-annual conference time designated for all parents.

Parent-Teacher Reactions and Evaluations

Table I shows that conferences were rated very high. Of the eleven rated highly successful by teachers, ten were reciprocally rated highly successful by parents.

In the course of the conferences over half of the parents commended the teachers and an equal number voluntarily indicated their high level of satisfaction with this means of pupil reporting in the questionnaires supplied them.

Characteristics of the Conferences

All teachers used some form of a guide for the conferences. A check sheet was used more frequently than the anecdotal informal guide although adherence to the check sheet as a guide and reference to it in the conferences indicated it was not preferred over the informal.

Harold John Maves is a full time graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley. He is on sabbatical leave from the Richmond School District where he has been an elementary teacher and Elementary Administrative Assistant. This article is a digest of his master's thesis which was completed at the University in January, 1954.

TABLE I
Rating of Twenty Four Individual Conferences By Parents and Teachers

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Number of Ratings Given By Parents</i>	<i>By Teachers</i>	<i>Total Number of Ratings Given</i>
Highly Successful	17	11	28
Successful	7	13	20
Unsuccessful	0	0	0
Total	24	24	48

Samples of children's work were used by less than half the teachers. Primary teachers using samples generally had a compilation of classwork. Intermediate and upper grade teachers used samples considerably less frequently and those used generally consisted of a recent specimen in one subject or copies of text books used in explanation to denote progress level or technique. When samples were used they contributed considerably to the ease and breadth of the conference but were not a determining factor in the actual rating by parents and teachers.

TABLE II
**Time Devoted to Total Conferences and to Certain Topics
 Within Conferences**

<i>Topics Discussed</i>	<i>Minutes Devoted to Topics</i>		
	<i>In Shortest Conference</i>	<i>In Longest Conference</i>	<i>Average of 24 Conferences</i>
Academic Growth	3.5	3.0	5.75
Behavior Development	1.5	31.0	10.97
Unrelated Conversation	.5	3.0	1.14
Total Conference Time	5.5	37.0	17.86

Table II shows that conferences ranged in length from 5.5 to 37 minutes and averaged 17.86 minutes. Teachers generally varied considerably in their individual time allotment suggesting flexibility to need. One teacher consistently used short periods of time for his conferences, averaging eight minutes for each. Two of these three were rated as highly successful by himself and the parent. One teacher was consistently long in allotting time, averaging thirty minutes. Two of these were mutually rated as highly successful. The ten conferences rated highly successful reciprocally averaged 16.65 minutes, the six consistently rated successful averaged 16.08, both indicating little variance from the norm.

Table II indicates that the time spent on socio-emotional development was practically double in comparison to that spent on academic growth. Table III shows that conferences were shorter in the low socio-economic area and that a greater percentage of time was devoted to academic growth there.

TABLE III
**Time Devoted to Conferences and Conference Topics, Distributed
on Basis of Socio-Economic Level of Parents**

<i>Topics Discussed</i>	<i>Time Devoted to Topics According to Socio-Economic Level</i>			
	<i>Middle Level</i>		<i>Low Level</i>	
	<i>Minutes</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Minutes</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Academic Growth	6.50	28.9	5.00	37.7
Behavior Development	15.12	67.2	6.83	51.5
Unrelated Conversation	.88	3.9	1.42	10.8
Total Conference Time	22.50	100.0	13.25	100.0

As Table IV indicates, teachers took the initiative in a majority of the conferences and out talked the parent two to one. Women teachers talked an average of 10.5 minutes per conference while men talked an average of 13.6 minutes.

TABLE IV
Comparison of Teacher Talking Time to Parent Talking Time

<i>Nature of Conference</i>	<i>Minutes Spent Talking</i>		<i>Total Time per Conference</i>
	<i>Teacher Time</i>	<i>Parent Time</i>	
With Least Teacher Talking	4.0	1.5	5.5
With Least Parent Talking	4.0	1.5	5.5
With Most Teacher Talking	30.5	6.5	37.0
With Most Parent Talking	11.0	15.0	26.0
Average of 24 Conferences	12.04	5.82	17.86

In tracing conferences to denote how they are developed to accomplish purposes the dissimilarity of pattern was pronounced. Teachers allowed for flexibility in adaptation to individual need and circumstance. Teachers tended to generalize in giving the objectives of the conferences but development of the conferences generally embodied specific treatment. Some teachers employed an indirect method of questioning, others used the direct

method. When the parents took the initiative teachers frequently accomplished their purposes from voluntary contributions encouraged by uninterrupted listening. Voluntary contributions of parents indicated that they were aware of their child's problems and appeared desirous of discussing it with the teacher. The content of the conferences further pointed out that teachers used the occasion to interpret school policies to parents and acquaint parents with their goals of teaching.

Implications

The parent-teacher conference type of pupil reporting will become widely used in modern school programs bent toward individualization since it makes possible the pooling of significant information relative to a child instead of that limited to a check mark, short note or letter.

There will be a tendency away from the check list type of guide to further individualize the conference. Teachers need to better plan their approach to encourage more parental response.

Advocates of bettered public relations for schools say that even the most casual contacts tend to influence the public toward schools, favorably or unfavorably. The parent-teacher conference, a resource existing in every community, is a dynamic potentiality for continuous publicity, educational interpretation and cooperative endeavor.

The Editors Say (Continued from Page 146)

of pupil rating? The State Legislature implies that this combination is needed in the public schools.

Research in this field must be of several types. The business of reporting to parents cuts across all segments of education theory and practice. Ultimate answers on how best to do this, if they are to be found, may be long years in the discovery. We should start now to get into this deep and basic research. We cannot wait, however, until we know all there is to know about human nature and the nature of a free society in order to decide what method of reporting pupil progress is immediately practical and desired by the patrons of the schools. The present generation of parents of school children can tell us if our reporting methods perform the task required. Do these help them do a better job as parents, or should we retain the older methods? Here is a lively topic for PTA and citizen study groups and local research. A call for brave volunteers!

Practices Relative to Satisfactory English Usage at Selected Institutions

R. GRANN LLOYD

Curriculum-makers, supervisors, and teachers need to be constantly on guard against two fallacies. The first fallacy, rarely stated, is that language arts (or English) is self-contained subject in the curricula, to be taught in isolation and ignored outside the language arts hour. That this fallacy sometimes governs practice is evident from the remonstrance too often made by . . . students when asked to speak or write well in social studies or science, 'Aw, this ain't the English class!' The second fallacy, sometimes explicitly stated by rash administrators, is that language arts or English has no subject matter of its own, is only a tool subject, and is adequately provided for through its employment in other subjects. This is much like saying one Siamese twin can be nurtured by feeding the other one. *The English Language Arts*.¹

The problem of satisfactory English usage is a perennial one at all levels of educational endeavor. Whereas, there seems to be no question about the growing importance of school-wide responsibility for satisfactory English usage, there is apparently little agreement as to the best methods of meeting the problem. On the other hand, it is generally agreed that one of the earmarks of all college graduates should be the ability to use the English language correctly, lucidly, and in a facile manner. There seems to be much evidence, however, that such is not the case. Indeed, the questions of satisfactory English usage and the problems associated therewith are highly important and, at one time or another, they must face every college and university in the country. Consequently, the writer conducted a study of prevailing practice relative to satisfactory English usage in 150 colleges and universities and solicited the attitudes of recognized authorities in the field of English on various phases of the study. This report is based on 77 usable responses, or a 51.3 per cent return.

¹The Commission on the English Curriculum, *The English Language Arts*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952, p. 199.

Raymond Grann Lloyd is Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Instructional Staff Committee on College-Wide Improvement of English at Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia. He has previously worked in the New York City Schools and in the School of Graduate Studies of South Carolina State College. He is Consultant on Educational Research to the National Lexicographic Board. He received his doctor of philosophy degree from New York University in 1946.

Each of the 77 responding institutions of higher education² indicated that they experienced serious difficulties with the English usage of their students during the school year. In this connection, it seems significant to note the areas in which they have experienced the greatest difficulties. "Misspelled words" constitute a major difficulty in 83.1 per cent of the responding colleges and universities; "faulty punctuation" is a major difficulty in 63.6 per cent; 'serious grammatical errors' in 62.3 per cent; 'illogical paragraphing' in 48.1 per cent; and "glaring speech errors" in 35.1 per cent. Commenting on this phase of the study, some respondents deprecate students' "slang expressions," "meagre vocabularies," "difficulty in thinking logically and imagining clearly," "inability to express thoughts in writing," "weakness in reading skills," and so forth.

The colleges and universities involved in this study seek to develop satisfactory English usage through the use of one or more devices. At 60 of the responding institutions efforts are made to resolve difficulties in English usage through formal courses; at 16 the tutorial system is used for this purpose; at 14 informal courses are offered; at 14 a system of independent study is in use; 14 use individual or personal conferences.

At 31 of the 60 institutions of higher learning, the formal courses required of students deficient in English usage are credit courses; at 27 schools such courses in English are non-credit courses; at two institutions some of these courses are offered for credit and some are non-credit. Then, too, 56 of the 59 responding institutions report that when either formal or informal courses are required of students deficient in English usage, satisfactory completion of such courses is determined on the basis of teacher judgment. Only three determine satisfactory completion of such courses on the basis of standardized tests results. In other words, 94.9 per cent of the colleges and universities responding to the particular inquiry, or 75.7 per cent of all the institutions involved in the study, rely on the judgment of their teachers.

Students are required to pass a proficiency test in English usage prior to graduation at 26 of the colleges and universities involved in this study.³ The findings reveal that such tests usually include (1) a business or formal letter, and (2) a section covering spelling, punctuation, sentence structure, usage, and organization—often in the form of an original theme on a topic chosen from a prepared list. However, a few institutions include an objective test on mechanics.

The foregoing outline of the findings of this study indicates the seriousness of the difficulties in correct English usage experienced by college students. It also affords some insight into the nature of institutional efforts to ameliorate or resolve the problem. Hence, the observable fact seems to be

²Names of institutions supplied on request by writing to the author.

³One institution reports that although students are not required to pass proficiency tests in English usage prior to graduation, students with serious deficiencies in usage "may be required to stay in remedial work all four years."

that it is an academic fault from both the practical and philosophical viewpoints for an institution of higher education to ignore or treat in a cursory manner students' difficulties in correct English usage.

Three significant questions emerge from this analysis of the problem:

1. What should be the policy of *all* teachers, regardless of their subject-matter field, with reference to satisfactory English usage?
2. To what extent, if any, should correct or incorrect English usage affect student ratings in non-English courses?
3. Is it possible and desirable to set up minimum essentials for satisfactory English usage at an educational institution? If it were to be done, what should these minimum essentials include?

The comments of many respondents and correspondence with authorities in the field of English clearly indicate that since learning in any field is incomplete unless the linguistic vehicle is mastered, all teachers should assume responsibility for the language with which their students handle their subject-matter. Since language must be used for all expression of thought in our society, both oral and written, correct English usage is necessarily the concern of *all* teachers. An English department, however competent, cannot possibly teach by itself in one hour a day a body of techniques and disciplines which can be effective in all fields. If students are not required to maintain the same standards in their other courses that they are required to meet in English courses, the teachers of English have practically no chance to discipline them into habitual good usage. Furthermore, the students are very likely to conclude that there is something artificial and meaningless about the standards of their English teachers if they are not held to the same standards of correct English usage elsewhere on the campus.

The work of the English classes should include the teaching of principles, but since habit plays such a vital role in our lives, most students will correct their errors only when all teachers demand correct English usage. This historic concept—that every teacher is a teacher of English—was forcibly re-emphasized in 1945 by the Harvard Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society. They stated that “all teachers of whatever subject have more than an incidental responsibility” [in the teaching of English]. “Instruction in language is thus inevitably a joint duty of all teachers.”⁴ Yet, 59.7 per cent of the 72 institutions responding to the present study report that only a small percentage of their teachers are effectively concerned with correct English usage by their students; only 20.8 per cent state that all or most of their teachers are effectively concerned; 19.4 per cent report that an encouraging number of their teachers are effectively concerned. A few typical comments relative to general faculty attitude toward the problem might be revealing:

“All talk much of correct English; two or three outside the English Department correct papers very carefully . . .”

⁴*General Education In A Free Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 116-117.

"Critical, but only a small per cent help in instruction."

"Deploring, but resigned, in general."

The evidence revealed by this inquiry seems to substantiate the position assumed by the committee on the requirements for the A.B. Degree at Miami University:⁵

... no college student has any right to ask his college professor to read any test or paper that is not written as well as he can write it. No college professor has any reason for giving more than a tentative mark to any slovenly paper; the permanent mark should be given only after a satisfactory revision. No teacher should be hired or retained who is not always alert to incorrectness, carelessness, and clumsiness in diction. No teacher aware of such shortcomings in his students has any right to assume that he is teaching a subject and not educating a student. No teacher of physical education or mathematics or anthropology or what not has any more right to remain ignorant of the ability or the inability of his students to use correct and acceptable English than he has to remain ignorant of their knowledge of the subject-matter of his course. No teacher has any right to avoid the responsibility that is his by saying, 'But I am not a teacher of English.' In part, graduates are judged and hired and advanced and condemned on the basis of their spelling, pronunciation, punctuation, and diction. In all fairness, they must have the assistance of all their teachers in this regard.

The essential reason for correct English usage is that it is a means of clear communication. The weight of authoritative opinion holds that the quality of students' written and oral expression should affect their ratings or grades. In fact, it is difficult to see how it can help but affect student grades because usually the student whose level of English usage is low is also likely to write vague, unformed, and confused sentences and paragraphs to such an extent that his meanings are not clear. Conversely, one recognizes and honors—perhaps unconsciously—a clear, logical presentation.

Neither double marks nor any other device that marks the subject and "English" separately should be advocated. However, the position frequently assumed is, for example, that grades should be affected to the extent that weakness in English usage constitutes weakness in communication and hence weakness in evidence of understanding the "non-English" subject-matter. In other words, misspelled words or faulty punctuation may not necessarily affect communication in the way that faulty organization or illogical paragraphing might; when they do so affect communication, the students' presentations should be penalized as faulty in terms of subject-matter, not as faulty "English."

At 30 institutions involved in this study, correct English usage reportedly has very little or no effect on students' ratings; at another 30 there is no institutional policy and the extent, if any, to which correct English usage affects students' grades varies with departments and instructors; it affects grades significantly at only 15 institutions of the institutions responding.

On the third issue, the weight of authoritative opinion contends that it is not only possible but extremely desirable to set up minimum essentials for satisfactory English usage in any educational institution. Indeed, 27 or

⁵*Report of the Committee on the Requirements for the A.B. Degree.* Oxford, Ohio: Miami University, 1948, pp. 15-16.

35.1 per cent of all the colleges and universities involved in this study have set up such minimum essentials on an institution-wide basis; four additional institutions have such minimum essentials for the English Department only; two more colleges plan to work out minimum essentials for satisfactory English usage during the current school year.

Many theorists contend that it is impossible to set up minimum essentials for satisfactory English usage. Although there are certain elements of correct English usage that would seem to be minimal anywhere, one might tolerate this contention if it refers to the country as a whole. However, if it refers to any given institution it seems quite possible for a faculty with good leadership to study the specific weaknesses in English usage prevalent in the particular student body. On the basis of the findings of such a study, a faculty would be in position to develop a list of minimum essentials for satisfactory English usage at their institution. Such a set of minimum essentials would be used as a guide, and not as a hard-and-fast set of requirements to be so rigidly enforced as to lead to "the absurdity of an intelligent student being deprived of a degree while an empty-headed parrot of correct phrases was granted one."

When a faculty develops minimum essentials for satisfactory English usage in the aforementioned manner, they are not imposed. They grow out of study and conferences that educate the faculty as they study and confer. This seems desirable since some of the cooperating institutions report that some faculty members are themselves incapable of satisfactory English usage. And yet, at the risk of being taken to task for being uncouth and presumptuous, the writer returns to the contention that there are certain elements of correct English usage that would seem to be minimal under all circumstances. Standard spelling, right sentence structure, proper punctuation, logical paragraphing, and good grammar at least at the informal levels would seem to be minimal everywhere. Clarity, precision and organization appear to be so important that they also should be universally minimal. Another almost automatic requisite is a vocabulary adequate to the subject the student is discussing. Indeed, it seems difficult for a teacher to render maximum service in an educational institution unless there is common agreement on the needs in expression of the students.

Two new series of sound filmstrips, in full color, are presented by the Los Angeles Board of Education as a contribution to teacher education in both pre-service and in-service classes. The new series visualizes teaching demonstrations in two areas, *Oral and Written Expression* and *Reading*, so that these subjects can be taught more effectively in the elementary grades. Showing actual classroom sessions by means of color photography and recordings, the pictures illustrate teaching techniques that have proved effective in the Los Angeles school system. They can be of great benefit to other school systems in the United States. The strips may be purchased from the Jam Handy Organization, 2821 East Grand Boulevard, Detroit 11, Michigan.

The Temperament of Gifted Children

MARCELLA RYSER BONSTALL AND BUFORD STEFFLRE

In the past decade there has been a revival of interest in the education of intellectually superior children. This points up the need for further study of the characteristics possessed by these children. Among the many research studies in this area are several which have produced objective testimony showing a favorable moderate divergence of gifted children from the unselected children on characteristic personality patterns in general.

The present study investigates temperament differences between the gifted and other high school senior boys, to determine the extent to which previously observed temperament differences were a function of "giftedness" and the extent to which they were a function of the socio-economic background of the gifted. Comparisons were first made of gifted and others at each of the several occupational levels. Then a comparison was made of all the gifted with all others disregarding the occupational level of the home.

The sample consists of 1,359 white high school senior boys in several high schools in a metropolitan area who in the course of a vocational counseling experience completed the SRA Primary Mental Abilities Test (here used as an index of giftedness), and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (here used as a temperament measure), and who gave enough information about the occupation of their wage earning parent (in most cases the father) to enable the occupation to be classified according to the Alba Edwards Scale.

On the basis of the total score on the Primary Mental Abilities Test students were designated as "gifted" if they were in the top 11 per cent of published norms. Parents' occupations of all students were classified according to the Alba Edwards six level scale—professional, managerial and official, clerical, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled. Within each of these occupational levels the gifted were compared with the others with regard to scores on each of the ten sections of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These ten sections are (1) General Activity, (2) Restraint, (3) Ascendancy, (4) Sociability, (5) Emotional Stability, (6) Objectivity, (7) Friendliness,

Marcella Ryser Bonsall is a supervisor in the Counseling and Guidance Service Branch of the Los Angeles City Schools and a lecturer in educational psychology at the University of Southern California. She was previously a graduate assistant in education at the University and an elementary principal in Los Angeles. She is a member of Pi Lambda Theta, Delta Kappa Gamma, and numerous professional organizations. She received the doctor of education degree from USC in 1952.

Buford Stefflre is a supervisor in the Counseling and Guidance Service of the Los Angeles City Schools. He is also a lecturer at the University of Southern California. He is a member of the American Psychological Association, Phi Delta Kappa, and many other professional organizations. Dr. Stefflre received his degree in education at USC in 1953.

(8) Thoughtfulness, (9) Personal Cooperation and (10) Masculinity of Interest. When these comparisons were subjected to the *t* test to determine the significance of the observed differences the results were as shown in Table I.

Differences Found

Those gifted boys whose fathers were classed as professionals manifest greater objectivity at the 1 per cent level when compared to non-gifted boys having professional fathers.

The gifted boys from homes where fathers are in managerial or clerical positions demonstrate more restraint, at the 1 per cent and the 5 per cent level respectively, than do non-gifted boys from like occupational backgrounds, and gifted boys from homes where the fathers are in managerial jobs are at the 1 per cent level more thoughtful than other boys from like homes. The boys classified as gifted whose fathers were employed in semi-skilled and skilled occupations reveal more masculinity at the 1 per cent and the 5 per cent levels, than did average ability boys whose fathers are working at similar jobs.

When gifted boys are compared with all other boys, with the occupational levels of the home disregarded, they show at the 1 per cent level more thoughtfulness, and, at the 5 per cent level more general activity, restraint, ascendance, emotional stability, objectivity and masculinity.

Effect of Socio-Economic Level

This study indicates that the previously found superiority of the "gifted" as regards temperament stems much more from the socio-economic level at which most gifted children are found than from any other difference in "gifted" children as such. When socio-economic background is taken into account, relatively few significant differences are found between "gifted" and others, but when the parent background of these children is disregarded, there seem to be differences in seven of the ten areas measured and in all these areas the "gifted" child has superior temperament scores.

Research using different measuring instruments might well have resulted in different findings and it is interesting to speculate on the influence of culture in developing or suppressing "giftedness." Certainly the incidence of giftedness is greatest among the more favored socio-economic groups and it is these groups which exhibit the temperament traits most valued by our educational institutions. This juxtaposition of high intelligence and valued temperament is not seen as wholly a matter of background, however, since restraint and thoughtfulness seem to be generally characteristic of gifted children. There were no significant differences between the total gifted and the total average students on the following temperament traits, sociability, friendliness, and personal cooperation. Many think the development of these traits should be given special attention as it is felt that from this gifted group should come more of the future leaders and that these traits may be important in many leadership situations. In teaching these students it may be important to keep such temperament differences and similarities

TABLE I
Significance of Differences in Temperament Traits Between Gifted and Non-Gifted

Home Level According to Alva Edwards Scale	Number of Students		Significance of Differences in Scores on Sections of Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey ¹											
	Gifted	Non- Gifted	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M		
Professional	18	160	n	n	n	n	n	**	n	n	n	n		n
Managerial-Official	37	354	n	**	n	n	n	n	n	**	n	n		n
Clerical	22	266	n	*	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n		n
Skilled	8	283	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	**	n	*		*
Semi-Skilled	7	157	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	**	n	**		**
Unskilled	0	37	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n		n
Total	92	1257	*	*	*	n	*	*	n	**	n	*		*

KEY: n No significant difference.

* Gifted superior at the 5 per cent level.

* Gifted superior at the 1 per cent level.

¹Sections are designated as follows: G—General Activity; R—Restraint; A—Ascendancy; S—Sociability; E—Emotional Stability; O—Objectivity; F—Friendliness; T—Thoughtfulness; P—Personal Cooperation; M—Masculinity of Interest.

in mind and check the findings of studies like this one against the situation as seen in the classroom.

Since this study suggests that failure to keep constant the socio-economic level in making comparisons of the temperament of gifted and other children results in misleading assumptions about the superior adjustment of the gifted, it may be well to re-study some of the findings of Terman and others. Is it possible that Terman in *Genetic Studies of Genius* in describing the multiple superiority of the gifted child is simply describing children from the upper socio-economic levels? If this is so, many of our assumptions about the "differences" of the gifted which call for special educational approaches and methods will need to be reconsidered.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Davidson, Helen H., *Personality and Economic Background: A Study of Highly Intelligent Children*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1943. 189pp.
2. Hollingsworth, Neta S. & Rust, Metta A., "Application of the Bernreuter Inventory of Personality of Highly Intelligent Adolescents." *Journal of Psychology*, 44:287-93, October, 1937.
3. Terman, Lewis M. and others, *Genetic Studies of Genius, Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Children*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1926, Vol. I, 648pp.
4. Terman, Lewis M. and Oden, Melita H., *The Gifted Child Grows Up. Twenty-five Year Follow-Up of a Superior Group*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1947, Vol. IV, 448pp.

"Providing for Exceptionally Talented Students" is the title of an article in the July, 1955, issue of *The Educational Record*. The author is Clarence H. Faust, president of the Fund for the Advancement of Education. Dr. Faust is concerned with the modification of higher education practices to better meet the needs of superior students. He suggests that these students should have much more freedom and independence in their studies than do average students. He also recommends that the possibilities of using superior students as junior aids or instructors be studied. These and other stimulating suggestions make the article interesting to all concerned with education of the gifted.

"List of Outstanding Curriculum Materials, 1951-1954: 1955 Edition" is the title of a new publication of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. It may be obtained for seventy-five cents from the Association's headquarters, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. It contains titles, source, and cost of obtaining the materials. They are classified according to grade level, subject matter, and educational activity concerned.

Leaderless Group Discussion And Experience in Group Leadership

ROBERT AMES

This study is an attempt to discover the relationship of leadership, as observed and rated in leaderless group discussion (LGD), with past experience in group leadership situations, as determined by a questionnaire.

There appears to be an increasing concern on the part of teacher training institutions and school systems with the problem of formulating and validating selective procedures for prospective teachers. Time and money can be saved or spent more wisely by teacher candidates, teacher training institutions and school systems, if efficient selective techniques can be devised. The ability to participate effectively in group discussion is generally considered to be a desirable characteristic of a teacher.

The leaderless group discussion technique as a form of situational test for the quantitative measurement of leadership is apparently of rather recent origin. Ansbacher (1) states that this device originated in the German military in 1925 and that it was used in postwar Germany as part of the entrance examinations to teachers colleges. As early as 1933, Eichler (7) concluded that it would be possible to measure leadership through student ratings of performance in LGD. Perhaps the most prolific writer in the field of leaderless group discussion is Bass (2, 3, 4, 5, 6). He has approached LGD as a psychological testing instrument and has gone far towards establishing its reliability and validity under various circumstances. The present study, it is hoped, will further advance LGD towards the same goal.

Procedure

The 180 students enrolled in a course in educational psychology at the University of California were divided into 20 groups of 9 members each. The total attendance at group meetings was 156 subjects. Each group was observed by the same two raters during a 30-minute discussion in which there was no appointed leader. Each individual in each group was rated independently by each rater on a 5-point scale for each of 10 characteristics considered to be evidence of leadership. In order to establish a common frame of reference, certain definitions were agreed upon by the two raters involved. Leadership was considered to mean a democratic type of direction of the group involving effective participation as a group member and evident acceptance by the group, rather than an authoritarian monopoliza-

Robert Ames is Consultant in Educational Psychology and Assistant Supervisor of Audio-Visual Education for the University of California at Berkeley. He was previously summer camp director for the Foundation for the Junior Blind. He received the master of arts degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1954 and is now working on his doctorate in educational psychology. This article is a digest of his master's thesis.

tion of the discussion by an aggressive individual. The ten variables used as criteria for LGD ratings closely approximate those recommended by Bass (2, page 468). They consist of *Knowledge of the topic*, *Quality of solutions*, *Holding positive views without antagonizing*, *Defining the problems and organizing group thinking*, *Initiative*, *Extent of influence*, *Motivating others*, *Talking effectiveness*, *Effectiveness as a group member*, and *Leadership* (acceptance as leader by the group). The total combined ratings for each individual were considered to be quantitative indices of leadership.

Of the 156 students who participated in the discussions, 135 completed questionnaires on participation in group activities in high school, college, employment, and other organizations. A weighted score was assigned to each activity in which the individual was a member, or in which an officer-ship was held. The weights were assigned as follows:

<i>Weight</i>	<i>Size of Group</i>	<i>Position</i>
1	Small or Large	Member
2	Small	Minor Position
3	Large	Minor Position
4	Small	Executive
5	Large	Executive

The total of the weighted scores for the individual was considered to be an index of experience. The questionnaires were rated separately by two judges as a measure of reliability.

Results

In comparing LGD ratings with experience, a low positive r of .26 was found to be significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. It was found, however, that the relationship was curvilinear in this sample. Only 3 cases lying below the mean of the LGD ratings are more than one SD above the mean of the experience ratings, and only one of these cases is more than two SD's above the mean of the experience ratings. This would seem to indicate that those subjects who obtain low LGD ratings tend to obtain low experience ratings. Conversely, those who have high experience ratings tend to obtain high LGD ratings. There is a third group, however, which gives the relationship between the two variables its curvilinear form. The subjects in this group obtained high LGD scores, but low ratings in experience.

Ratings of performance were made separately by two observers. The r of .87 between these ratings compares favorably with any reported in the field of LGD, and would appear to indicate that the ratings show a substantially high degree of reliability.

Discussion

The curvilinear relationship between LGD ratings and experience would seem to indicate that experience in leadership situations is perhaps not

prerequisite to effective performance in LGD, but that the two variables are so related to each other that the subjects exhibiting high experience ratings tend to obtain high LGD ratings, and the subjects obtaining low LGD ratings tend to evidence little experience in group leadership situations. The fact that 28 subjects obtained high LGD ratings but low experience ratings raises an interesting point. If it can be assumed that the LGD ratings are valid indices of leadership, there is a possibility that this situational test can be employed to reveal leadership qualities which would ordinarily remain undiscovered by the traditional autobiographical techniques.

Several factors limit the general applicability of this study. Time did not permit verification of the experience stated on the questionnaire. Also, it is not known whether all subjects submitted complete accounts of past experience in group leadership situations. Because of absences, the number of subjects could not be kept constant. Therefore, the groups varied in size from 6 to 9 subjects per group, and the size of the original sample decreased. The assumption that group membership has weight in indicating participation in group leadership situations is perhaps open to some question. Inasmuch as membership does imply participation, it was felt that this status deserved more weight than non-membership, although it may be that many members are merely followers and many non-members are potential leaders. The terms "leadership" and "experience" are used in special context in this study and generalizations therefrom should be made with caution. Finally, it is not known whether students at other levels would exhibit similar behavior or whether similar results could be obtained with a different sample.

Summary

This experiment was designed to study the relationship between performance in leaderless group discussion and past experience in group leadership situations.

The subjects were 135 students enrolled in an educational psychology course at the University of California who participated in leaderless group discussions and responded to a questionnaire on past experience in group leadership situations.

Performance in LGD was quantified by the use of ten rating variables, each of which was scored on a 5-point scale for each individual. The sum of the points accumulated during a 30-minute discussion comprised the subject's LGD score.

Experience in group participation and group leadership was quantified by the assignment of weighted scores for degrees of membership and leadership in group situations as determined through the administration of a questionnaire. The sum of the points accumulated on the questionnaire comprised the individual's experience score.

The scores obtained for the two variables were then compared. A low positive correlation of .26 was found between LGD ratings and experience. This correlation is significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. The relationship between the two variables, however, was curvilinear, indicating that experience in leadership situations, as defined in this study, is perhaps not prerequisite to effective performance in LGD, as herein measured, but that the two variables are significantly related to one another.

Further research should of course include a larger sample of subjects. It would be desirable to develop some method of verifying the experience stated on questionnaires, and of ascertaining whether the experience stated was complete. Better control of attendance at group meetings would be desirable for purposes of keeping the size of the groups constant. Finally, follow-up studies should be made to determine the relationship of these results to student-teaching and to future participation in group situations.

The findings of the present study should in no respect be generalized beyond the population involved, but this study does suggest some possible investigations in the field of leaderless group discussion and the advisability of quantifying objective data. Much more research and the continuing development of better instruments of measurement are needed in order to obtain more definitive conclusions in these areas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ansbacher, H. L. "Lasting and Passing Effects of German Military Psychology." *Sociometry*, 1949, 12:301-12.
2. Bass, Bernard M. "The Leaderless Group Discussion." *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 51, No. 5, Sept., 1954, 465-492.
3. Bass, Bernard M. "An Analysis of the Leaderless Group Discussion." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Dec., 1949, 33:527-33.
4. Bass, Bernard M. "The Leaderless Group Discussion Technique." *Personnel Psychology*, Spring, 1950, 3:17-32.
5. Bass, Bernard M. "Situational Tests: I. Individual Interviews Compared with Leaderless Group Discussions." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Spring, 1951, Vol. 11, No. 1: 67-75.
6. Bass, Bernard M. "Situational Tests: II. Leaderless Group Discussion Variables." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Summer, 1951, Vol. 11, No. 2, 196-207.
7. Eichler, G. A. and Merrill, R. R. "Can Social Leadership be Improved by Instruction in its Techniques?" *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Dec., 1933, Vol. 7, No. 4: 233-36.

Research Studies in Education—1953 is the title of a new publication of Phi Delta Kappa. It contains sixty pages of listings classified under more than 40 library-approved subdivisions, complete with author's name, title of study, and institution where undertaken, plus four pages of Research Methods Bibliography. Publication of the *Research Studies in Education* series is expected to be a continuing activity of Phi Delta Kappa. The 1954 edition is now in process of compilation. The 1953 edition mentioned here is available for three dollars (if payment is included with order) from Phi Delta Kappa, 2034 Ridge Road, Homewood, Illinois.

Changes in GATB Scores with College Training

GARTH SORENSON AND NOEL SENIOR

Several studies of the relationship between GATB¹ scores and college grades have indicated that the GATB might well become a useful instrument in college counseling and selection programs. (1,2,3) A prerequisite to such usefulness, however, is information regarding the influence of college training upon the various scores. The present study provides some data on this problem in the form of original and retest scores on two groups of college students, one of which was retested after four weeks, the second after four academic years.

The Scores Used

Of the ten scores which were obtained from the complete battery, the following six were used in the present study:

- V—Verbal from a same-opposite verbal test.
- S—Spatial Aptitude from a spatial discrimination test.
- Q—Clerical Aptitude from a names comparison test.
- R—Reasoning from a logic test.
- N—Numerical aptitude which combines an arithmetic computation and an arithmetic reasoning test.
- G—Intelligence which combines the spatial discrimination, arithmetic reasoning and same-opposite verbal tests.

The Samples

The tests were administered to first quarter freshmen at the University of Utah during the academic year 1948-49 in the General Education I

¹GATB refers to the General Aptitude Test Battery developed in conjunction with the Occupational Counseling Service of the U. S. Employment Service.

A. Garth Sorenson is an assistant professor at the University of California at Los Angeles. He was previously an assistant professor at the University of Utah and Assistant Director of the Student Guidance Center of the University of Utah. He received the doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Utah in 1950.

Noel Senior was associated with Dr. Sorenson in work at the Student Guidance Center. Her master's thesis was based on some of the data used in this article. However, this present publication presents material developed by both authors on the basis of data collected between 1948 and 1952.

class. The 119 students in Group 1 were retested after four weeks and are all those who entered the winter quarter and who were in attendance both testing days. They were registered mainly in general as opposed to professional courses. The 146 students in Group 2 were tested in the Fall of 1948 and again in June of 1952 during the last quarter of their senior year. They were selected in the following manner:

One thousand two hundred and ninety-one entering freshmen were tested in the Fall of 1948. Of this group, 265 were reported in May 1952 as candidates for graduation.² All in this group were invited by letter and by follow-up letter to report for a retest. Those who were unable to come or who preferred not to do so were not required to be retested. Those who were retested graduated in a wide variety of majors in the Colleges of Business, Education, the University College, and there were a few engineers but with no one from law, medicine or architecture included.

The Findings

It will be noted from the table that (1) substantial gains were made in most of the scores upon retest; (2) except for the R scores on Group 2 and the N score on Group 2, all gains were significant at the .001 level of probability; (3) on scores S, R, and G, the four-week gain is greater than the four-year gain; (4) on V and Q the four-year gain is greater.

Discussion

Considering the fact that the initial performance of Group I was lower on all scores than that of Group 2, it might have been hypothesized that greater gains, if any, would be made by Group 1. Since the periods between test and retest are not at all comparable for the two groups, it is not possible to test this hypothesis with the above data. However, one might speculate that since Group 1's gains on scores S, H and G were greater after four weeks than the gains made by Group 2 after four years, the hypothesis would be confirmed, and had Group 1 continued in college four years and then been retested, its gains would be even greater. Or one might make an alternative guess that the greater gains made by Group 1 were merely due to the effect of practice and would not be present after a four-year

²The apparently extreme attrition is to be accounted for as follows: The University of Utah is a state institution and consequently must have a liberal admissions policy. As a result, it is estimated that somewhat fewer than a third in any given entering freshman class graduated. The professional colleges require five or more years for graduation and some of the students in the original population reported above are thus still enrolled in one of these colleges. There is a strong tradition of "working one's way through college" with the result that some students require additional time to complete the traditional four-year course. Furthermore, a substantial group of male Latter Day Saint students interrupts college to attend a two-year "mission" for their church, thus graduating about six years from time of admission.

TABLE I
A Summary of Six GATB Tests and Retest Standard Scores for Two Groups of College Students*

<i>T</i> Test	Group	<i>M</i> ₁	<i>SD</i> ₁	<i>M</i> ₂	<i>SD</i> ₂	<i>t</i> Ratio	<i>r</i> Test-Retest	<i>SE</i> _{<i>r</i>}
V—Verbal Aptitude	I	108	14.7	114	15.5	8.1	.83	.029
	II	120	13.4	129	14.9	11.1	.77	.034
S—Spatial Aptitude	I	120	17.5	129	18.6	9.1	.82	.030
	II	122	17.2	129	18.7	6.8	.77	.033
Q—Clerical Aptitude	I	104	17.6	112	18.3	19.3	.88	.020
	II	113	14.9	128	17.4	12.6	.62	.051
R—Reasoning	I	119	16.1	129	15.4	8.7	.70	.047
	II	135	12.5	137	12.9	1.4	.61	.052
N—Numerical Aptitude	I	112	16.2	115	15.3	5.2	.88	.021
	II	114	14.7	117	15.1	3.1	.79	.031
G—Intelligence	I	117	14.2	125	14.5	10.4	.84	.027
	II	123	14.8	127	15.6	4.1	.77	.034

* Group 1 (N = 119) was retested after four weeks.

Group 2 (N = 146) was retested after four academic years.

period. Unfortunately, since both samples are small and neither represents the college population, the above data perhaps raise more questions than they answer.

It is interesting to note, however, that as is found to be the case in studies of such less factorially "pure" tests as the Ohio State Psychological Examination and the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, the GATB scores listed above have increased significantly with college training. The reliabilities of the test scores over a four-year period are somewhat comparable to the reliability coefficient of .73 reported by Shields (4) for students at the University of Utah on the Ohio State Psychological Examination, and the correlation between freshmen and senior scores on the A.C.E. Psychological Examination of .83 reported by McConnell (5). The counselor or other user of the GATB must remember that while r 's of this magnitude are rather impressive so far as groups are concerned, nevertheless a few individual cases may be expected to present rather extreme increases or decreases. In Group 2 on the G test, for example, 52 out of 146 students increased their scores on retest by one-half standard deviation or more, while 17 decreased their scores by at least one-half standard deviation. Two students in the sample increased their scores by as much as two standard deviations, and one showed a decrease almost as great. The four-year gains reported above are generally smaller in terms of standard deviations than those reported by McConnell for the A.C.E.

In spite of the limitations mentioned above, the data suggest that one might expect college training to produce significant increases in the six GATB scores under discussion. It is also probable that there will be a few individuals whose scores may actually be lower upon retest after college training.

REFERENCES

1. GATB Senior Project Staff, Department of Psychology, University of Utah. "General Aptitude Test Battery Pattern for College Areas," *Occupations*, XXIX (April, 1951), 518-526.
2. Jex, Frank B. and Sorenson, A. Garth, "A Preliminary Study of Six GATB Scores as Predictors of College Grades," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* (February, 1953), 31:295-7.
3. Storrs, Sibyl V. "Evaluative Data on the GATB," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, Vol. XXXI (November, 1952), 87-90.
4. Shields, Mary Watson, "An Analysis of the Effect of Four Years of College Training Upon the Test Scores of a Psychological Examination." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Utah, 1938.
5. McConnell, T. R. "Changes in Scores on the ACE Psychological Examination from Freshman Year to Senior Year," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXV (1934), 66-69.

Evaluation of Group Processes in a Sixth Grade Social Studies Program

GEORGE BOVYER

The study was an attempt to determine how well children can: (1) Devise democratic standards to govern their actions, (2) learn the standards they have helped to formulate, (3) use these standards in rating scales to evaluate their actions, (4) use the scales to measure growth in group processes.

The development of democratic behavior continues to be one of the main objectives of American Education. Social studies offer special opportunities for the development and practice of group behavior. It is possible for children to share in planning the work, to help in developing standards of conduct, and to participate in the evaluation of their work and behavior. These activities may be done by the class as a whole, by committees, and by individual pupils. Interaction among the boys and girls can and should be utilized to help develop democratic behavior. Successful cooperative experiences in the classroom will help teach children to get along well with others in the present and future, at school, at home, and in the community. To be learned successfully, democratic citizenship should be practiced.

Three areas of group activity in social studies were selected for study. These were group discussions involving the whole class, committee work, and the chairmanship of a committee. Democracy, per se, was not taught. The study was conducted over fourteen weeks, during which time a unit on aviation, which had been started earlier, was concluded and one on the Hawaiian Islands was conducted.

Development of Standards

Standards of conduct were developed by the children, under the guidance of the teacher, for the three areas of group activity under consideration. The children wrote and voiced their suggestions at the beginning and end of the study. Three rating scales were devised from these standards. The boys and girls rated themselves at the beginning and end of the study for all three activities, and also at the middle of the study for committee work. In addition, they rated their fellow committee members for group work and the chairmanship. The instructor participated in all of the ratings.

A five point scale was used in the evaluation for each standard. From highest to lowest the points were "Always," "Most of the Time," "Half the

George Gilbert Boyer is Principal at Elizabeth Sherman Elementary School in Oakland, California. He has previously served as an elementary teacher and as a substitute elementary principal in Oakland. He received the master of arts degree in education from the University of California at Berkeley in 1955. This article is a digest of his thesis.

Time," "Hardly Ever," and "Never." Numerical values from four to zero were given the five points so that weighted scores would facilitate an analysis and comparison of scores by and for individuals, committees, the class as a whole, and by the teacher.

Further analyses were made concerning: (1) Other standards mentioned by the children that were not included in the standards chosen for the rating scales, (2) the possible use of fewer than the ten standards that were formulated by the children for the three scales, (3) the distribution of all ratings given for group discussions, and (4) the use of the sociometric technique in committee work.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the data of the study:

1. The children successfully devised democratic standards of conduct for discussions, committee work, and the chairmanship.
2. The children increased their knowledge of acceptable standards of conduct in group work during the experiment.
3. Favorable habits not included in the standards being stressed were also developed during the group activities.
4. The children generally rated themselves lower at the end than at the beginning of the study. This may have been the result of: (a) The children's powers of discrimination might have increased during the study and they were possibly giving more exact ratings at the conclusions, (b) they had no previous experience with rating scales, and they had to learn to use them, (c) this was their first extensive participation in committee work.
5. The teacher generally rated the pupils higher at the end of the study.
6. The scoring by the class and the teacher generally became more similar as the study progressed.
7. The average scores by the children for class discussions indicated that the boys and girls could have judged their actions nearly as well with a five or a three-standard rating scale as with a ten-standard scale. The teacher's scores were similar for the ten and five-standard scales but not for the three-standard scale.
8. Some standards had little or no distribution of ratings along the scale. This may indicate that a number of standards had limited use for demonstrating growth and making comparisons between individuals.
9. Ratings by the pupils and the teacher indicated that a relationship exists between the more popular members of a committee and the ones who receive higher weighted scores for committee work.

Further Study Needed

The writer believes the following questions are worthy of consideration for further study:

1. Would lengthening of the experimental period demonstrate growth in democratic acts by increases in the weighted scores by the children?

RATING SCALE FOR GROUP DISCUSSIONS

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Most the time</i>	<i>Half the time</i>	<i>Hardly Ever</i>	<i>Never</i>
In a group discussion I:					
— take turns talking.....	—	—	—	—	—
— let the other person finish speaking....	—	—	—	—	—
— take part in the discussions.....	—	—	—	—	—
— stick to the subject.....	—	—	—	—	—
— know what I'm talking about.....	—	—	—	—	—
— ask good questions.....	—	—	—	—	—
— talk clearly	—	—	—	—	—
— am quiet	—	—	—	—	—
— pay attention	—	—	—	—	—
— talk only a short time.....	—	—	—	—	—

RATING SCALE FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Most the time</i>	<i>Half the time</i>	<i>Hardly Ever</i>	<i>Never</i>
In committee work I:					
— take part in the work with the others...	—	—	—	—	—
— take turns talking.....	—	—	—	—	—
— am courteous and polite.....	—	—	—	—	—
— stick to my job.....	—	—	—	—	—
— discuss things before starting to work..	—	—	—	—	—
— work neatly and accurately.....	—	—	—	—	—
— am serious about the work.....	—	—	—	—	—
— share books and other things.....	—	—	—	—	—
— help clean up at the end of the period...	—	—	—	—	—
— share in presenting the report.....	—	—	—	—	—

RATING SCALE FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Most the time</i>	<i>Half the time</i>	<i>Hardly Ever</i>	<i>Never</i>
Our committee chairman:					
— is fair to all the committee members...	—	—	—	—	—
— discusses the work with us.....	—	—	—	—	—
— helps to divide the work evenly.....	—	—	—	—	—
— is serious about the work.....	—	—	—	—	—
— helps us stick to the subject.....	—	—	—	—	—
— is courteous and polite.....	—	—	—	—	—
— helps us clean up and sees to it that things are put away.....	—	—	—	—	—
— is cheerful and friendly.....	—	—	—	—	—
— lets the committee members help make decisions	—	—	—	—	—
— knows what he is supposed to do.....	—	—	—	—	—

2. As boys and girls mature, how much do their abilities to discriminate increase?
3. Would it be beneficial to revise standards on rating scales periodically?
4. How many standards should be on rating scales for groups of children of various ages and abilities?
5. How many degrees of performance, or points, should there be along rating scales?
6. Are the more popular members given higher weighted scores on rating scales only because they are well liked?

Science Research Associates has been awarded the contract for preparing, supervising the administration, and scoring of the Selective Service College Qualification Test for next year. This is the second consecutive year that the contract has been awarded to SRA. The Test will be administered on November 17 and on April 19 in about 875 testing centers throughout the country. The Test has been designed to determine scholastic aptitude. It takes three hours to administer and is expected to measure abilities in two broad areas—quantitative reasoning and verbal or linguistic ability.

"The Demand and Supply of Teachers 1954-55" is the title of a report issued in May, 1955, by the New Jersey State Department of Education. It is a very comprehensive study and interpretation of the nature of teacher turnover in that State. Perhaps the most interesting finding is that most so-called new teachers are really former teachers returning to the profession after one or more years of homemaking or other non-teaching work.

"Legal Provisions for Safeguarding Student Activity Funds" is the title of an NEA Research Division *Special Memo* issued in August, 1955. It includes a summary of the pertinent laws, rules, and regulations of the various states and territories. The report indicates that many states and local school systems operate under very meager and indefinite rules. It was concluded that, "in the absence of statewide mandatory procedures, local initiative may adopt any theory or practice deemed most acceptable locally." The final conclusion of the study is that, "Perhaps this area of the safeguarding of student activities funds needs further exploration to clarify the issues and the best procedures."

Superior Graduates Look at Their High School Guidance

MICHAEL HERBERT KITTREDGE

The author's interest in the guidance of superior students led him to the Bureau of Research of the San Francisco Unified School District where such students have been identified and studied throughout their elementary and secondary education. The following statement by Dr. Lillie Lewin Bowman, Director of the Bureau, indicates the value of post school follow-up:

As a part of the San Francisco Unified School District's program for improving educational opportunities for the gifted, it was felt that our gifted graduates could make a valuable contribution. A critical analysis of the high school program by such students four years after their graduation should be of significant value in planning future programs for the intellectually gifted.

The Problem

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the effectiveness of San Francisco's high school guidance program and curricular offerings for intellectually superior students as a basis for improving articulation with post-school activities.

The Method

The superior group of 188 graduates studied by Mrs. Bernice Vukota of the Bureau of Research in 1950 constituted the experimental group. This group, having intelligence quotients ranging from 120 to 171, was compared with an average group of students with intelligence quotients ranging from 90 to 109, from the same schools. These were selected from the average group in Mrs. Vukota's growth study. A questionnaire was developed to give students from each group an opportunity to express their attitudes toward their high school program, three years after graduation.

The results of the study are based upon a statistical analysis of these responses, with attention given to sex differences and to post-high school occupations, for example: student, Armed Forces, homemaking, or occupational field. Only those questions common to all groups have been reproduced for this article.

Michael Herbert Kittredge is an elementary teacher in San Francisco who is on leave of absence for active duty with the United States Army. He is serving as a second lieutenant in the field of personnel. He majored in psychology at San Jose State College. This article is a digest of his thesis for his master's degree, which he received in 1954.

Results and Conclusions

Of interest as well as significance at the outset, 92 per cent of the superior group returned the questionnaires and only 77 per cent of the average group returned theirs. Considering such factors as change of residence, of occupation, and in many cases change of name, the 77 per cent may be considered a high return. The phenomenally higher percentage of response of the superior students shows an eagerness on their part to report on their high school activities.

The questionnaire, which inquired into the extent and effectiveness of the counseling program yielded the following results on the favorable side:

1. More than three-fourths of the superior group reported that
 - a) They were encouraged to go to their counselor,
 - b) Time was available during the school day to see the counselor,
 - c) Counselors discussed test results and school records with them and assisted them in planning their program, and
 - d) School programs were adapted to their needs.
2. Three-fourths of the group reported that they received help in
 - a) Getting along with people,
 - b) Participating in and enjoying social activities,
 - c) Discovering one's interests,
 - d) Use of English, and
 - e) Care of health.
3. Ninety per cent of the group reported having been encouraged to participate in activities other than those of an academic nature; while
 - a) Eighty per cent reported participation in extra-curricular activities, and
 - b) The same number found such participation of benefit during high school years and since graduation.
4. More than eighty per cent of the subjects said there was a member of the high school staff to whom they felt willing to take their academic problems.
5. The courses considered of greatest value were, in the order listed, English, Physical Education, Typing, and Senior Goals.
6. Of the 126 students who went on to college or university, 70 per cent of whom were in the superior group and 30 per cent the average group, more than 60 per cent felt that information furnished to them while in high school concerning academic preparation for college was of great or adequate value.

Among the foregoing conclusions there were no significant differences between the superior students and the control group.

On the less favorable side, the following weaknesses were listed:

1. More than sixty per cent of the superior group felt that their high school course was not difficult enough; while over 60 per cent of the average group felt that it enabled them to work to capacity.

2. More than 60 per cent of the superior group felt that more help was needed in developing study habits.
3. Over half the superior group reported that there was no one to whom they felt willing to take their personal problems.
4. Over 70 per cent reported there was no one to whom they felt willing to take their social problems.
5. The majority of the members of both groups who are in specific vocational areas reported that they would have liked greater preparation for employment, Armed Forces, homemaking, and for successful marriage and child care.

Implications

Although the superior graduates expressed general satisfaction with their high school guidance program, there is little to indicate that their treatment, other than academic programming, differed from that of the average student. It is reasonable to infer, however, from the high percentage of returns, that their attitude toward their former school was generally favorable.

Strengths of the program include general guidance practices, various phases of individual development, benefits of the extra-curricular program and preparation for college work. Weaknesses appeared in the adult-pupil relationship with regard to the student's personal and social problems. It may be hypothesized that a closer adult-student relationship is necessitated for social and personal relationships than the present time allotment permits. From the summary there appears to be a need for a more challenging program for superior students and more help in developing effective study habits.

"Teacher Opinion of the Value of the NEA" is the title of a study reported in July in a *Special Memo of the NEA Research Division*. The study was made by Mrs. Louis F. McCormick of Shreveport, Louisiana. The author found that experienced teachers were more likely to the NEA members than were beginners, that elementary teachers were more often members than secondary teachers, that membership was more common among city teachers than country teachers, and that the larger the school the smaller the percentage of NEA membership. The most common reason reported for belonging was the realization that "in unity there is strength"; the most common reason for not belonging was inability to afford membership. Reasons for not belonging were much more varied than were reasons for belonging.

This study was made in the form of a questionnaire sent to "810 classroom teachers and school administrators of the white schools in Caddo Parish, Louisiana." Seventy-six and four-tenths per cent of those receiving questionnaires replied. In view of the extreme limitation of the sample, it may seem questionable for the results to have been given national status and distribution through a *Special Memo*. Certainly the findings are expressed in unjustifiably broad terms. However, the NEA Research Division must be given credit for stating the limitations of the study at the very beginning of the report.

Sociometric Analysis and Personality Adjustment

ROBERT LOUIS SATTERLEE

Teachers, working with groups of children, occasionally use sociograms to make schematic representations of the interpersonal relationships operating in a classroom. It is of interest to discover what relationships there are between the way children react towards each other (sociometric status as leaders, isolates, rejectees, etc.) and the way that they look at themselves in a personality test.

Other Related Investigations

The use of sociometric methods in school, as a means of looking at the middle range of children, who are neither highly chosen nor left out, has been described by Jennings (12: p. 12). The advantages of regrouping in the classroom on the basis of sociometric choice and its related implications have been discussed by several investigators (1, 4, 5, 7, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 and others). Sociometric techniques as a means of looking at the individual's basic needs has been discussed by Jennings (11).

Limitations of the sociometric method and what it will *not* do have been emphasized by Brickell (4), Loomis and Pepinsky (14) and Warters (22). The "social atom" as a unit of interpersonal measurement has been evaluated by Jennings (11) and others. Jennings finds that the "social atom" as a measurement of interpersonal relations "is not randomly variable in its composition from one time to another in the same individual." (10).

Method of This Study

A series of sociometric tests was given to two consecutive fifth grade classes in a small non-agricultural northern California community. When the first class had progressed to the seventh grade, and the second class to the sixth, Rogers' "A Test of Personality Adjustment" (19) was given, along with a final test of sociometric choice. Three sociometric tests were used from each class.

The data were plotted (21) on sociograms for each different test, and used for seating arrangements or for social studies committee assignments, according to the design of the particular test. The data were also entered in sociomatrices (8). A 5x8 inch filing card was prepared for each child on each sociogram, and coded with notched holes for the sociometric data and

Robert Louis Satterlee was a graduate student in Counseling and Guidance at Chico State College in 1954-55. This is a summary of his thesis for the Master of Arts degree. At the present time he is a teaching assistant at the University of California at Los Angeles.

with marked edges for the personality test data. The cards were sorted according to sex, class, sociometric choice, etc., using notches and holes, and tabulated by counting the marked edges according to the number of children in each of the "maladjustment" categories on the Rogers Test (Personal, Social, Family, Daydreaming, and Total).

Findings

Rank order correlations were computed between the five components of the Rogers Test and the total algebraic sum of sociometric choices received on each sociogram. (Table I.)

The sociogram for both classes given at the time of the Rogers Test was combined into one group according to sociometric (algebraic) scores received and correlated with the Rogers Test Total raw scores, with $r = +.314$.

A biserial correlation between numerical Rogers Test Total raw scores and an arbitrary division of sociometric choices received (bimodal of 0 to 2 and 3 or more positive choices) yielded r (biserial) $= +.342$.

Chi-square contingency tables were set up to examine the relationship between dichotomous sociometric criteria and Rogers' ratings of high, average, and low in each of his classifications of maladjustment. The sociometric dichotomies used, together with values of Chi-square and the related values of P are given in Table II.

The most significant of these relationships: Personal Inferiority .03, Family Relations .02, and Daydreaming .02 were between Isolates/Stars as shown in the group's appraisal of the individual, and in the individual's appraisal of himself in the group.

Conclusion

There is a low, but definite correlation between sociometric choice of the group toward an individual, and the individual's self-appraisal of himself in that group. There is a significant relationship between sociometric stars and isolates, and ratings made on the Rogers Personality Test.

The sociometric test shows an individual in the light of his interpersonal group relations—how he fits into the group, as seen from the group's standpoint. The Rogers Test is an interpretation of how the child thinks he fits into the group. Any correlation or relation between these two might also be an indication of how well adjusted a group of individuals might be in their realistic self-appraisal of themselves. The sociometric and personality tests are not measuring the same thing, and a relationship might indicate the validity of an individual's reality testing.

Implications For Further Research

An unlimited number of choices in a sociometric test is more reliable than the use of a limited number (3, 9, 11). The social distance scale (6, 20) does not compare visually with the more graphic sociogram, but is particularly well adapted to the measurement of social acceptance in inter-personal relations. These modifications are recommended.

TABLE I
Rank Order Correlations of Scores in Certain Categories of Rogers Test of Personality Adjustment and Scores in Three Sociometric Tests

"Maladjustment" Categories of Rogers Test	Sociograms of Class "A"			Sociograms of Class "B"		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Personal	+24	+16	-.09	+28	-.12	-.01
Social	+01	+15	+28	+16	+58	+58
Family	.00	+30	+83	-.09	-.10	-.10
Daydreaming	+06	+34	+43	+13	+40	+30
Total Maladjustment Score	+.24	+.33	+.58	+.27	+.54	+.34
Number who took Rogers Test	13	13	15	13	13	18
Did not take Rogers Test (moved, absent)	12	11	1	8	8	3
Total number of students on sociogram	25	24	16	21	21	21

TABLE II
Chi-Square Contingencies of Sociometric Dichotomies and Rogers Criteria

Sociometric Dichotomy	Maladjustment Classifications (Rogers Test)					
	Personal x^2	Social x^2	Family x^2	Day Dreaming x^2	Total x^2	P
Rejection vs. No rejection	.63	.75	2.53	.28	1.36	.55
Star vs. No Star	4.36	.12	3.67	.17	3.48	.18
Isolation vs. Star	7.07	.03	2.86	.25	8.01	.02
Cross sex vs. No cross sex	.82	.60	2.91	.24	4.21	.13
Reciprocal choice vs. No reciprocal choice	2.10	.35	1.64	.40	2.09	.40
					3.74	.16
					1.18	.58
					1.67	.42
					4.61	.10
					2.42	.30
					.73	.65

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, Gretchen. "The sociogram as an instrument in social studies teaching and evaluation." *Elementary School Journal* 50: 74-85, October 1949.
3. Bonney, Merl. "Sociometric study of the peer acceptance of rural students in three consolidated high schools." *Educational Administration and Supervision* 37: 234-40, 1951.
2. Bonney, Merl. "The relative stability of social, intellectual, and academic status in Grades 2-4, and the interrelationships between these various forms of growth." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 34: 88-102, 1943.
4. Brickell, H. M. "What you can do with sociograms." *English Journal* 39: 256-61, May 1950.
5. Cook, Lloyd Allen. "An experimental sociographic study of a stratified tenth grade class." *American Sociological Review* 36, April 1945.
6. Cunningham, Ruth and associates. *Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
7. Dahlke, H. O., and Monahan, T. O. "Problems in the application of sociometry to schools." *School Review* 57: 223-34, April 1949.
8. Dodd, S. C. "The interrelation matrix." *Sociometry* 3: 91-101, 1940.
9. Eng, Erling, and French, Robert L. "The determination of sociometric status." *Sociometry* 11: 368-371, 1948.
10. Jennings, H. H. "Experimental evidence on the social atom at two time points." *Sociometry* 5: 135-145, 1942.
11. Jennings, H. H. *Leadership and isolation; a study of personality in interpersonal relations*. New York: Longmans, 1950.
12. Jennings, H. H. *Sociometry in group relations: a work guide for teachers*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1948.
13. Kerstetter, Leona M., and Sargent, Joseph. "Re-assignment therapy in the classroom." *Sociometry* 3: 293-306, 1940.
14. Loomis, Charles P. and Pepinsky, Harold B. "Sociometry 1937-1947: theory and methods." *Sociometry* 11: 262-286, 1948.
15. Moreno, F. B. "Sociometric status of children in a nursery school." *Sociometry* 5: 395-411, 1942.
16. Moreno, J. L. *Plan and technique of developing a prison into a socialized community*. New York: National Committee on Prisons and Labor, 1932.
17. Moreno, J. L. *Who shall survive?: Foundations of sociometry group psychotherapy and sociodrama*. New York: Beacon House, 1953.
18. Olson, Willard C. "Human relations in the classroom." *National Education Association Journal* 36: 640-41, December 1947.
19. Rogers, Carl R. *A test of personality adjustment*. New York: Association Press, 1931.
20. Singer, Arthur. "Certain aspects of personality and their relation to certain group modes, and constancy of friendship choices." *Journal of Educational Research* 45: 33-42, September 1951.
21. Taba, Hilda. *A Sociometric work guide for teachers*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1947.
22. Warters, Jane. "Guidance through groups." *Review of Educational Research* 21: 142, April 1951.

Homemaking Offerings in California

GEORGE N. BEAUMARIAGE

Homemaking as an offering in public schools is achieving more stature every year. The course, once offered only in senior high schools, now is offered in elementary schools. The purpose of this study was to determine (1) the present status of homemaking as a course offering, (2) how courses of study were developed, and (3) what was being used for text material. This study is concerned with offerings in the seventh and eighth grades.

Letters were sent to forty-six districts which might have homemaking, selected because of their size and potential ability to finance such a course. Fifty per cent of these, representing county offices, elementary districts, city districts, and one unified district, answered the letter. Table I shows a breakdown of the replies.¹ A basic course of study was made by compiling all of the replies; and the statements made in them were also summarized.

It is interesting to note that only one-third of the schools answering had homemaking programs. Only one-eighth of the schools required the seventh grade girls to participate in the program; while only one sixth required the eighth grade girls to participate.

Ten schools, or one-fifth of the total, indicated that they had written courses of study. Only two indicated that they used the State course of study. Undoubtedly the correlation of local to State course of study is very high. A review of the courses of study submitted reveals that there is either an accidental relationship to the State guide or else the districts have referred to this guide as they prepared their own. It is suggested that the State guide was used at least as reference material.

Of great interest to curriculum workers is the fact that only four schools indicated that the course of study was developed by the teachers. This, plus the fact that four other schools stated they were presently developing a course of study through teacher participation, brings the total of teacher developed courses to only fifteen percent. Since the principle of teacher involvement is well accepted as the most desirable, it behooves the curriculum worker to look into the acceptance of a stated principle as it compares

¹Further information received and presently available from the writer includes lists of random material, texts, films, filmstrips, and curriculum guides. These are too lengthy to include here.

George Nestor Beaumariage, Jr., is Curriculum Director of the Ravenswood School District of Menlo Park, California. He was previously County Coordinator of Education for Tuolumne County, a teacher in the Freedom Union School District, and an instructor at Case Institute and Fenn College in Cleveland, Ohio. He received the master of arts degree from Stanford University in 1951. This article is a digest of a survey done for the Ravenswood School District.

to the practice. There seems to be evidence here of the old practice of guides prepared by "experts being handed to teachers to "police" the subject matter covered. A far better approach would have been to use "experts" as consultants to the teachers as they developed their own guides, thus removing the necessity for extensive follow-ups to see to it that the guides are used. A very fundamental rule applicable here is that a person who has helped to develop a guide and therefore has a vested interest in the guide is far more likely to use and follow it in the teaching situation.

TABLE I
Breakdown of Replies to Inquiries

Have homemaking program.....	16
Required of 7th grade girls.....	6
Required of 7th grade boys.....	1
Required of 8th grade girls.....	8
Required of 8th grade boys.....	2
Have course of study.....	10
Use State course of study.....	2
Course of study developed by teachers.....	4
Course of study for grade 7 now being worked on...	2
Course of study for grade 8 now being worked on...	2

Basically it seems that the general program followed can be best represented by a course-of-study outline such as the following:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| I. Foods | III. Homemaking |
| a. Equipment | a. House planning |
| b. Planning | b. Interior decorating |
| c. Preparation | c. Budgeting |
| d. Nutrition | d. Home nursing |
| e. Serving | e. Home safety |
| II. Personal Appearance | IV. First Aid |
| a. Grooming | V. Child Care |
| b. Style and color | (Use of Kindergarten) |
| c. Techniques of dressmaking | a. Baby sitting |
| d. Making simple clothes | b. Sibling and emotional problems |

Foods and clothing are taught in the seventh grade. At this level only the basic factors are touched on. For instance, in clothing only the knowledge of materials, needles, pins, and handsewing are taught. The work of this year is to provide all of the children with the basic knowledge they will need to use in more complicated meal planning and cooking as well as the making of most of their own clothes at a later level.

On the eighth grade level more advance work in cooking, foods, and sewing are undertaken. At the same time the factors of etiquette, human relations, homemaking, first aid, and child care are included. Baby sitting as a job and responsibility is generally explored at this level, but practice varies according to the community structure.

No single textbook was used in any district. Instead, a great diversity of materials was the rule in almost every district. There seems to be a need for a good core type text for grades seven and eight.

Summary of Findings

1. Seventh-grade homemaking tends more to be elective. Few districts require it.
2. Seventh-grade homemaking tends to be limited due to lack of space and personnel.
3. Personnel and space have not allowed as extensive a program in homemaking as is desired by most districts. The building shortage has seriously curtailed programs.
4. The inclusion of boys in the program of homemaking has not progressed very far. It seems to be coming into practice. More districts favor it than actually practice it.
5. The text materials used in homemaking courses are varied. Multiple texts are the rule rather than the exception. There seems to be a demand for texts in this area that has not been filled as yet.
6. Articulation is a must between seventh-grade and all upper-grade homemaking courses. All districts build up the program in accordance with the maturity of the pupils.
7. Many manufacturer's materials are used in homemaking classes. These generally have to be adapted to fit elementary usage.
8. Audio visual aids for homemaking are not as numerous as one would expect. Much could be done to adapt more materials to fit these programs.
9. Homemaking programs and personnel are tending to become more a part of the total education program and are no longer a separate identity.
10. The homemaking program offers an opportunity for children to be introduced to teaching as they observe kindergartens. Recruiting can thus begin early.

More than \$108,000,000 for philanthropic purposes is held by 136 California foundations and trusts, according to the results of a three-year nation-wide survey conducted by the American Foundations Information Service. Grants made by these philanthropic bodies in a single year totaled \$6,184,148, according to the latest records obtained in the survey. The appropriations embraced 44 broad fields of interest ranging from aesthetics to youth, with emphasis on education, religion, and health and medicine. This, however, is not the entire picture, the Director pointed out, because more than 50 foundations and trusts in California failed to reveal to the Service the size of their tax exempt funds or the amounts given away.

Workshop on Action Research

A two-week workshop on action research was conducted at Occidental College, Los Angeles, during the early part of August. It was sponsored jointly by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the California School Supervisors Association, and was under the direction of Dr. Harry Smollenburg of the Research Department of the Los Angeles County Schools. During the first week Dr. Stephen M. Corey of Columbia University served as a consultant. Others who worked with him were Dr. Prudence Bostwick of Denver, and Mr. George Denemark, Executive Secretary of the ASCD. Consultants who served through both weeks of the workshop were from California and included Doctors Thomas Shellhammer and Bernard Lonsdale of the State Department of Education; Dr. Edwin C. Clark, Director of Research for Burbank City Schools; Dr. Loretta Byers of the Santa Barbara College of the University of California; Dr. Garford Gordon of the California Teachers Association; and Dr. Roy Petrie of Occidental College.

The Workshop was constructed around three types of sessions. General sessions were devoted to expositions of the principles of research and of the particular types of research activities which constitute "action research." Basic work groups formed the sections in which members of the workshop did most of their discussion of these principles and their application. Special interest groups met only for two days each. In these, special techniques useful in research activities were reviewed and practiced. Each workshop member had an opportunity to participate in three different special interest groups.

In discussing "action research" Dr. Corey was very careful to explain that it did not differ in any fundamental respect from other types of educational research. It is, rather, an attempt to bring the problem-solving methods of research into more intimate contact with everyday school and classroom procedures. Both "action" and "regular" research involve definitions of problems, gathering and evaluating of data, and drawing of conclusions from data. The major difference is to be found in the type of problem considered and the use of the results. "Action research" deals with immediate problems and results in tentative conclusions; whereas "regular research" usually deals with general problems and attempts to get at generally valid conclusions.

The workshop was felt by all staff members and participants to be very valuable. It was hoped that it would prove to be the first of an annual series. In the future it is expected that wider participation by teachers and school research personnel will be achieved. This year members were mostly principals, supervisors, and teacher-training personnel. However, some teachers and other educational workers were also present.

Book Reviews

BASAL READING INSTRUCTION

Gerald A. Yoakam. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955. 357 pages.

Dr. Yoakam is Professor of Education and Director of Courses in Elementary Education at the University of Pittsburgh. He has worked on reading problems for many years and is author of the Yoakum Readability formula for determination of grade placement of books.

In *Basal Reading Instruction* Dr. Yoakam surveys the whole problem of instructing students in reading. The book is, of course, primarily directed to the elementary school situation, but considerable reference is made to application of the techniques discussed to secondary, adult, and higher education. The book is divided into three parts. The first deals with the nature of reading and the physical, psychological, and social factors involved in reading and reading instruction. Part Two takes up in order the eight steps that the author considers essential in reading instruction. The last part concerns the development of integrated reading programs in schools and the present status of basal reading instruction.

While the general considerations contained in the first and third parts of the book are valuable and well written, there is no doubt that the major contribution of this publication is to be found in Part Two. The eight chapters of this part cover the eight steps in learning to read, as formulated by the author. These are, in order, development of readiness; development of sight recognition; development of independence in word recognition; achievement and extension of meaning; development of fluency in cursory reading; learning how to locate, assimilate, organize, and retain ideas; learning how to use ideas in everyday living; and learning how to choose reading materials and to plan reading experiences.

It can be seen from this outline that Dr. Yoakam views reading as a thinking process. He so states in the first part of the book and proceeds to develop this thesis in detail throughout the text. However, although he builds on this idea as a basic principle, he brings into play all the special techniques which may be of use. Those interested in current controversies on reading will be interested to note the place given to phonics. They are viewed as useful as one technique for developing some of the skills necessary for effective reading.

The appendix contains an explanation of the Yoakam Readability Formula and full directions for its use.

PROBLEMS IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF READING

Ruth Strang, Constance M. McCullough, and Arthur E. Traxler (Second Edition).
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955. 426 p.

This book is primarily the work of Dr. Strang, who wrote fifteen of the twenty chapters. Dr. McCullough was responsible for four chapters on specific practices in schools and in special subjects; while Dr. Traxler wrote a chapter on the use of tests in appraising students' reading ability. The authors acknowledge the help of many other students of reading problems.

The volume represents an attempt to fuse theory and practice in the consideration of reading problems. The authors show that they mean business in this respect by starting out with a three-page section on "How to Read This Book" which seems very practical indeed.

The work is divided into three parts. The first concerns the whole-school program, the second deals with reading in content fields, and the third covers appraisal and remediation. The emphasis which is placed upon teacher participation in planning and teacher initiative and originality in execution of reading programs, makes the first part of the book outstanding. The emphasis on the necessity for teaching reading in all school situations, is very good in the second part. The specific techniques presented for determining and overcoming reading difficulties make the third part notable.

The authors may have attempted to cram too much into one volume. The book is not meant for casual reading so that the fact that it contains so many different facts and ideas that the reader tends to become confused is probably not a fault. It would seem, though, that some of the important ideas and techniques presented should have been followed through in more detail even if this meant that some of the less valuable ones had to be omitted. Nevertheless, this book is an important addition to the literature on reading.

ADULT EDUCATION

Homer Kempfer. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955. 433 pages.

The author is Executive Director of the National Home Study Council and was formerly Specialist for General Adult and Post-High-School Education in the U.S. Office of Education. He has also worked for six years with the Bureau of Adult Education of the New York State Education Department.

This book deals with the general purposes of adult education, the methods of developing adult education programs, and the specifics of organizing and administering such programs. The author is by far the most successful in his treatment of the first of these three areas. His analysis of the nature and purposes of education to show how it is a life-long process, is very well done. If education can and should go on throughout a person's adult years, this has great implications for the total educational program, not just for adult education. But the implications for adult education are also tremendous. It cannot be limited to merely remedial work, or to purely avocational activities. It must be a full, well-rounded educational program.

The author is considerably less successful in dealing with the techniques of program development. True, he does show the pitfalls of various haphazard and formalized methods of setting up programs. Unfortunately, he does not offer a complete discussion of positive methods of determining and setting up adult school programs. This weakness seems to be, in part, due to the author's tendency to describe current practice in terms of the number of programs using certain techniques without evaluating the programs.

This weakness is particularly noticeable to one who is familiar with adult education in California. From the point of view of the number of school systems involved, practices are as described in the book. And it is true that clear and concrete methods of developing successful programs do not stand out. However, this would appear to be due to the inclusion of much material from states and cities in which general adult education is not yet accepted as a regular public school responsibility. Hence, for most California educators, the book will be chiefly valuable only for its consideration of the goals of adult education and for its survey of current practices in the rest of the country. It is very regrettable that the author did not study California programs more closely before writing this volume.

PLANNING FOR TALENTED YOUTH

Considerations for Public Schools

A. Harry Passow, Miriam Goldberg, Abraham J. Tannenbaum, and Will French.
New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.
84 pages.

This pamphlet is Publication I of the Talented Youth Project of the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation. It represents a general survey of the problem of providing for gifted children rather than a specific attack upon the situation. Among the areas considered are the historical development of interest in superior students, the nature of intellectual superiority, attitudes that exist toward the talented, means of identifying gifted children, types of plans for making special provision for them, and ways of evaluating programs of providing for them.

The publication attempts to present the facts and allow the reader largely to draw his own conclusions. This is ably done. However, it would seem that some of the issues on which arguments for and against are presented have been pretty well settled. It would probably have been more useful to have devoted more time to the pros and cons of some more specific proposals than are considered in the bulk of the pamphlet.

There is probably a place for yet another rehash of the questions of whether or not special provisions should be made for gifted students, of what the nature of genius is, and of whether segregation, enrichment, or acceleration are best as ways of providing for superior students. If there is, this booklet is a very worthy candidate for that place. Its concise format and handy pocket size may help it to be brought to the notice of busy superintendents who must read as they run.

PSYCHOLOGY FOR LIFE

Harry Ruja. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955. 427 pages.

The author is on the faculty of San Diego State College. He has prepared the book primarily for beginning students of psychology. As he states in his preface, he has not attempted to cover the entire field of psychology but has rather tried to give an intensive treatment of such topics as learning, memory, intelligence, thinking, and mental hygiene.

The book is largely free of the pedantry and narrowness which characterize many texts on psychology. The author does not depart from orthodox views on psychological matters, but where serious reason to doubt these exists he has said so and has indicated some of the possible alternatives to currently accepted dogma. His style is free and lively, so that the book should appeal to the better minds among those who begin the study of psychology. On the other hand, he has given definite and clear treatment to the great mass of basic psychological material which is non-controversial. The book should also prove entirely adequate to the average student.

Much of the material in the book is designed to be directly useful to the student in his own life. For this reason some of the applications seem to be rather more strictly limited to college-age situations than a completely well-rounded treatment of the subject would require. On the whole, though, the book would seem to furnish a very adequate background for further work in psychology, education, and related fields.

WORDS FOR WORK

Jewish Vocational Service of Greater Boston. 140 pages. One Dollar.

The subtitle of this handbook is "Trade Terms for a Tutoring Program for New Americans." The "New Americans" involved all seem to come from German-speaking countries since the bulk of the publication consists of a German-English dictionary involving words applying to various skilled and semi-skilled trades.

The Foreword states that the trade terms used were developed through use of the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, experience of counselors working in voluntary and governmental agencies, and records of terminology used by employers in job orders to the Jewish Vocational Service. It is stated that "We have found job placement to be considerably facilitated when there is a knowledge of basic job terminology for a particular trade even though conversational English may still be limited."

In spite of its limited scope and rather sketchy organization, the book will prove of interest to those involved in vocational guidance for foreign-speaking persons. It should also prove helpful to those involved in Americanization programs and programs of English for the foreign born. It very definitely raises the question of whether or not a similar handbook could be developed for use with Spanish-speaking individuals in the West.





CALIFORNIA JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Published by
California Teachers Association
693 Sutter Street
San Francisco 2, California

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING MANUSCRIPTS

The California Journal of Educational Research welcomes original manuscripts on educational research. The types of material desired are:

1. City and county school research pertaining to curriculum, guidance and counseling, evaluation, supervision, and finance.
2. Digests of theses and dissertations that have practical application. Such theses and dissertations, however, must officially be approved for publication by a member of the Editorial Board (see names on inside of front cover) or by the college or university at which the research was done.
3. Studies that present novel, but tested, approaches to the solution of educational problems.

Manuscripts, except for feature articles, should be limited to approximately 1500 words. They should be typewritten double-spaced, on one side of the paper, and submitted in duplicate. Only original manuscripts will be accepted for publication.

Tables, charts, and graphs often enhance a research report. When used, they should be clearly and accurately labeled. They should also be inked to size and their places designated in the manuscript.

Footnotes should be complete as to author, title, publisher, date and pages. Bibliographies accompanying manuscripts should also be complete as to data, and should be arranged alphabetically by authors.

Manuscripts will not be returned unless the author so requests, in which case a stamped, self-addressed envelope should accompany the manuscript.